

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

ALONZO J. SEVERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

ELON MUSK, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C25-948-JNW

ORDER

Plaintiff has filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) in the above-entitled action. (Dkt. # 1.) In the IFP application, Plaintiff indicates that he has never been employed and has not received any financial assistance in the past twelve months. (*Id.* at 1.) He reports having no cash on hand, no funds in checking or savings accounts, and no monthly expenses. (*Id.* at 2.) He also indicates that he contributes \$6,000.00 per month toward supporting dependents, but fails to specify his relationship to these individuals or where that money is from. (*Id.*) Plaintiff left blank the portion of the application requesting information that would help explain why he cannot pay court fees and costs. (*See id.*)

The district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed IFP upon completion of a proper affidavit of indigence. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). “To qualify for *in forma pauperis* status,

1 a civil litigant must demonstrate both that the litigant is unable to pay court fees and that the  
2 claims he or she seeks to pursue are not frivolous.” *Ogunsalu v. Nair*, 117 F. App’x 522, 523  
3 (9th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 544 U.S. 1051 (2005). To meet the first prong of this test, a litigant  
4 must show that he or she “cannot because of his [or her] poverty pay or give security for the  
5 costs and still be able to provide him[ or her]self and dependents with the necessities of life.”  
6 *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948) (internal alterations  
7 omitted).

8 Plaintiff’s IFP application omits information necessary for the Court to determine  
9 whether he is able to afford court fees. While he reports no income or expenses, his claim of  
10 contributing \$6,000.00 monthly toward supporting dependents raises questions that cannot be  
11 resolved without further clarification. Plaintiff should not be granted permission to proceed IFP  
12 until this information is provided.

13 Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause by **June 13, 2025**, why the Court  
14 should not recommend his IFP application be denied. In the alternative, on or before that date,  
15 Plaintiff may file an amended IFP application clarifying the matters noted above. The Clerk is  
16 directed to renote Plaintiff’s IFP application (dkt. # 1) for **June 13, 2025**, and to send copies of  
17 this order to Plaintiff, along with a blank IFP application, and to the Honorable Jamal N.  
18 Whitehead.

19 Dated this 29th day of May, 2025.

20 

21 MICHELLE L. PETERSON  
22 United States Magistrate Judge  
23